

L B
1715
B87
1902
MAIN

UC-NRLF



B 2 750 035

YD 03164

GIFT OF



EX LIBRIS

Taylor & Francis
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

PRINTED FROM
JOURNAL OF PEDAGOGY
SEPTEMBER, 1902.

K

GIFT
MAY 19 1914

A PLAN

OF

PREPARING TEACHERS

BY

FREDERICK BURK

STATE NORMAL SCHOOL, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

State of California
Department of Education

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



A Plan of Preparing Teachers

THE State Normal School at San Francisco was established by Act of Legislature, March 22, 1899. Upon organization, its Board of Trustees recognized that the state is not in need, at present, of a larger number of persons holding certificates to teach. It was determined, therefore, to make no effort to build up a large school, but to bend all energies toward establishing a school which should graduate only teachers of superior efficiency. In determining upon this policy the Board took measures to guard against two causes of failure which in the history of normal school administration, have been more or less destructive: (1) a low standard of admission, which has made it impossible to give, in the limited period of normal school instruction, necessary academic instruction, the pedagogics of education, and adequate practical training; (2) personal and political interference in the administration of the school. At the meeting of the Joint Board of California Normal Schools held July, 1899, immediately after the organization of the San Francisco Board, a resolution was adopted providing that graduation of accredited (high) schools with credentials for admission to the State University should be accepted as equivalent to the first two years of the regular normal school course of four years. The San Francisco school organized upon the authority of this provision.

In the matter of administration of the affairs of the school, the appointment of its faculty, and its internal management, the Board in June, 1901, after two years' experience, upon motion of Trustee F. A. Hyde, reduced to written form its policy of management in resolutions which were unanimously adopted, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS DEFINING POLICY

WHEREAS, State Normal Schools are supported and should be conducted for the sole purpose of supplying public schools with teachers of the highest efficiency;

AND WHEREAS, The Trustees of the San Francisco State Normal School desire that the school shall be so conducted that a certificate of graduation therefrom shall be esteemed an honorable distinction by the holder thereof, as being a certain guarantee of thorough training and proficiency as a teacher, and so recognized by school officials;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,

First—That it is the determined policy of this Board that the faculty shall be selected, as heretofore, upon a basis of merit alone, wholly uninfluenced by personal or political interference or consideration, and the Trustees therefore require that all applications for positions in the faculty be first submitted to the President of the School, who will nominate to the Board those whom he may deem most competent and meritorious.

Second—That the President shall continue to maintain the present high standard of admission to the school, and his judgment and decision in individual cases shall be final; and where, after a fair trial, it shall appear to him that a student shows an incapacity to become a thoroughly efficient teacher, it shall be his duty to discourage the student from further attendance at the school.

Third—That the President shall certify to the Trustees for graduation only those students who can be confidently and honestly recommended to School Trustees, Superintendents, and Boards of Education, as teachers of undoubted capability.

Under these conditions, the internal management of the school was intrusted to the faculty by the Trustees. A new school, free from hampering traditions and conditions, whose Trustees are resolved to maintain it strictly upon an educational basis possesses by birthright certain advantages.

General or Academic Scholarship vs. Technical Instruction:—The faculty determined in the first place, that the school should give no courses in general scholarship to do which is already the function of the public school system; but should direct its energy exclusively into the channels of technical preparation for teaching. A normal school is a technical school, ranking in character with the schools of medicine, engineering, law and trade learning. The public school system is expected to provide pupils with that kind of general knowledge, culture and training which concerns life common to all people whatever their occupation may be. The technical school obtains students after this general education and training are accomplished, and its only concern should be to determine the stage of academic instruction at

which students may be recruited into its special service; or, in short, to set a standard of academic knowledge requisite for admission. It is manifestly a serious breach of economy to maintain a public school system to furnish this general education and then permit the technical schools to duplicate parts of it.

The judgment of experience in America has set, as a reasonable ideal of scholarship prerequisite to normal training, that scholarship represented by graduation from a high school. This, however, is an ideal which has not actually been realized, to any great extent, by normal schools. In the early stages of the development of the public school system there were few high schools. Normal schools, in the dilemma, were forced into the task of giving a certain amount of academic work above the grade of grammar school graduation. This was merely a temporary makeshift, and clearly, in a four years' normal course, both the academic work of a high school and the technical work of a normal school proper cannot be included without slighting either one or the other, or both, and befogging the real purpose of normal training.

The San Francisco Normal School is located in the midst of a very large number of the best high schools in the United States, and therefore the requirements for admission were made identical with those for admission to the State University. These requirements demand graduation from an accredited school with a special recommendation from the high school principal.

Thus the San Francisco Normal School stands for a sharp distinction between general or academic scholarship and the technical or professional training special to teachers. No courses whatever are given in purely academic studies and the school centers its energies exclusively upon professional training. It must be recognized that general scholarship in a teacher cannot be overdone. As soon as higher requirements in general scholarship can expediently be insisted upon, they should be made but they should be made a provision in the standard of admission, not as a part of

normal instruction. The normal school must preserve distinct its identity as a technical school.

Preparation for Class Teaching Exclusively:—The faculty, as a further limitation, decided to confine the school's energy strictly to the effort of preparing students to teach well those subjects which usually constitute the course of study in the primary and grammar schools; and to disavow distinctly all ambitious notions of preparing special teachers, supervisors, superintendents, etc. The normal school course at best is none too long and this scattering of energy over a number of occasional purposes has too often weakened efficiency in essentials. The San Francisco school has undertaken the single problem of giving its students, by technical pedagogic study and actual teaching of classes, familiarity in presenting all standard subjects, and experience in practically all the grades of the school. Those applicants for admission who express a desire for courses which should prepare them for the larger executive fields of education, such as supervision and superintendency, are advised first to take a thorough course in the university as a preliminary basis for such a field. The San Francisco school limits itself to the more modest field of thorough preparation in the details of class teaching.

THE THREE FUNCTIONS OF NORMAL SCHOOLS:—The history of education, common experience and the judgment of expert school men are in tolerable agreement that the three chief essentials of efficiency in teaching are:

A Teaching Personality.

General Scholarship and Culture.

Ability in the Arts of Teaching.

These essentials are not stated in any order of relative importance. It is impossible to do this for each has a distinct function, and to fulfill this function each is indispensable. The error preeminent in the preparation of teachers has been that loose kind of thinking which has assumed that one of these essentials, in high degree, can serve as a substitute for either or both the others. Once a disputant becomes a special pleader for one of these

essentials, it seems necessary, in order to assert the importance of this quality, to maintain that the others are insignificant and may be disregarded. Popular observers, as a class, have been prone to deify personality to the denial of the art of teaching and scholarship; pedants and professional scholars deify scholarship to the denial of personality and the acquired arts; and it has been the weakness of normal schools, in their turn, to put forth the arts of instruction in the light of such importance that in practice they have minimized scholarship and disregarded the function of personality. Yet it is manifest without argument that each of these qualifications in itself is, to a certain degree, an indispensable requisite. In the preparation of teachers, provision must be made to secure each of these qualifications. The plan of the San Francisco Normal School includes distinct provisions for each of these essentials. The provision for general scholarship is made by the requirements for admission and the school, as a strictly technical institution, does not attempt to add to the general scholarship represented by the standard of admission. That knowledge which is technical to teaching, receives treatment. The internal working of the school will therefore now be discussed under the following headings arranged for convenience of treatment in the following order:

1. Selection of Personality.
2. Teaching the Arts of Instruction: (a) the arts of practice, (b) technical scholarship.

THE SELECTION OF PERSONALITY:—Personality is much more readily recognized than defined in words. Perhaps, in a general way, we may say that the suitable teaching personality usually includes a warmth of sympathy for children, a certain simplicity of character and manner of thought, a kind of earnestness, gentleness with a reserve of firmness, patience, cheeriness and often qualities of tone of voice, gesture, movements, carriage, facial expression and mannerisms of address. That these qualities, or deficiencies in them, play a most vital role in the make-up

of the efficiency of a teacher goes without saying. In the casual judgment of most lay observers, these elements of superior personality are accepted as completing the qualifications of any teacher; and school trustees, in a large percentage of their selections, go no further than to consider the personality, 'which, to their minds, is a substitute for the art of teaching, or, to a certain limit, for scholarship. Further, in most thoughtful observers' convictions, scholarship without personality is hopelessly inefficient, while the arts of instruction cannot even be acquired without it. It is a *conditio sine qua non*. The striking feature of personality is the fact that it is inborn and cannot be acquired. No system of instruction, no training can furnish it to those who lack it. All that we may acquire of personality we may class under arts of teaching.

In the mere statement of what personality is, therefore, the normal school, which undertakes to fit persons for the occupation of teaching, is confronted by a perpendicular difficulty. Here is something which is one indispensable essential of efficiency in teaching, and yet it is something which no system of instruction can supply. Scholarship and the arts of teaching are essentials which can be taught, but personality, also an absolute essential, is not a product of acquirement.

It is a most singular fact that in the entire history of the development of the normal school idea, we do not find provision which in any systematic way deals with this vital fact, yet it conditions success at the outset. Manifestly, by the very nature of personality there is only one possible system of dealing with it—persons who are essentially lacking in those inborn native qualities which make personality must be eliminated from the normal schools, if the normal school is to graduate efficient teachers. But not only has there been no practical system of elimination in operation, but even the theoretical admission of the importance of personality has never been prominent in normal school pedagogy. Students have been admitted to

the normal school upon examinations testing scholarship; they have made their successive steps of progress by virtue of the same test and finally have been graduated upon a basis of examinations showing merely ability to acquire knowledge. As will be later discussed, the ability to state theories of education, or even verbally to describe arts or methods of teaching, has very little bearing upon the actual ability to teach efficiently. It is just in this gap between verbal knowledge and really doing the thing, that personality enters as the determining factor. If the system of preparing teachers neglects the consideration of personality, as an essential factor, it is not surprising that so large a percentage of normal graduates and also university graduates, who have stood the highest tests of examinations upon paper, fail as teachers. They fail because they have not the inborn birthright to teach. Scholarship and verbal knowledge of the arts of instruction, without this ordination by nature, is as useful as a well filled lamp without a match by which to light it. It is difficult to comprehend who is benefited by this neglect to eliminate those who have not the personality suitable for teaching—certainly not those unfortunates who are trundled through the normal schools and colleges, and are finally certificated only to discover, perhaps after years of repeated failures when it is too late to start life over again, that they have been deluded into a calling which could never yield them the fruits of their legitimate ambition; certainly not the unfortunate children whose lives must be seriously affected; and, finally, for the normal schools this neglect to eliminate the unsuitable in personality, has certainly been a most shortsighted policy. It assists in accounting for the singular fact that the whole theory of professional training is still a question in the public mind. Defects in personality are quickly recognized by the public mind, and these failures have been charged to normal school training. One chief function of a normal school, therefore, must be to select suitable personalities, and rigidly to eliminate those who are essentially lacking.

In view of these facts, the San Francisco Normal School has felt itself called upon to meet this problem of selecting the personality of those whom it undertakes to graduate as teachers, as a duty which permits no compromise. It is a duty which the school owes, not only to the State and the public school system, but also to its students as individuals. If a student is handicapped by inborn qualities unfitting her to realize reasonable ambitions in the field of teaching, then it is clearly a service to such a student to discover this fact as early as possible that she may seek some other and more suitable calling. The members of the faculty recognize that in undertaking to select teaching personalities, they are assuming an exceedingly grave and difficult responsibility. Judgment at best is liable to err, either favorably or unfavorably. However, in practice, a just and simple process of elimination has made the task much easier than it seems. The system in vogue in most normal schools of giving instruction in the theory of education first and concentrating all actual practice in teaching into a few months at the end of the course, has served as a serious detriment to any system of eliminating unsuitable personalities. The proper teaching personality is tested only by actual teaching and this system therefore throws the decision of personality into the last months of the normal course. It is then rather late to make decision, even if the limited time given to training were adequate justly to make such a vital determination. The system of the San Francisco Normal School requires that the new students should immediately enter the training school for one third of each day, as assistant teachers, and their duties gradually increase until they have complete charge. Their actual teaching extends over the whole period of their normal school course of two years or more. They are thus early brought into contact with children and with the working atmosphere of the classroom. They are under constant but sympathetic observation of the members of the normal school faculty. After a time, sometimes in ten weeks, and generally in six

months, the faculty having compared impressions, render a joint judgment of the personality of each student, as well as of the scholarship and ability to acquire the arts of instruction. This judgment is frankly stated to the student. It is a distinct understanding that the judgment upon personality is merely advisory in force; the faculty does not undertake the grave responsibility of dismissal except in extreme cases. The student is permitted to continue in attendance, if she chooses, but on the other hand, it is of course understood that no certificate of graduation will be issued until the faculty feels prepared to assume the responsibility for the success of the person concerned as a teacher.

The practical working out of this system justifies it. The records show that about twenty per cent. of the students who enter the normal school later drop out by reason of these judgments of unsuitable personality. All unfavorable judgments of the faculty stated to students have been practically unanimous. On the other hand, the students concerned are themselves almost as quick and ready to realize that they have mistaken their calling as the members of the faculty, and they have certainly, almost without exception, shown an admirable spirit in the matter. No student has thus far been formally dismissed, because this step has not yet proven necessary.

THE ARTS OF TEACHING:—First, what are these arts which the normal school may legitimately profess to furnish provided the essentials of inborn personality exist in the student? Examples of a few may easily be mentioned: methods of teaching the first steps of reading to beginners; the use of correct language forms in speech and composition, the ability to manipulate figures in the common operations with accuracy and rapidity and with the least expenditure of time; methods of presenting geographical and historical facts and science so that, with the least expenditure of the pupil's time, the essential elements of knowledge contained in them may serve the later practical purposes of intelligent citizenship;

devices of management of groups of pupils in classes, etc., etc.

The schools are suffering at present no more keenly from any defect than from the lack, or careless administration, of many of these teaching arts. There are many methods of this character in use of widely varying efficiency even in teachers of the same favorable conditions of personality. In many schools beginners in reading, for example, make more progress in two years, under certain arts of instruction than under others in four years, yet both have teachers of equal personality. It should readily be admitted that these superior arts may be acquired by unaided personal experience without normal training. But personal experience by the process of trial and error may be very slow and the errors of inexperience may become fixed and irradicable defects of habit which even the most favored personality cannot offset. It is an injustice to pupils to permit a teacher, who in time may possibly acquire the arts of teaching by years of experience to gain her power of teaching at the expense of the children who unfortunately come under her instruction during this formative period. Herein lies the chief justification for the establishment of the normal school. If it will eliminate the unsuitable personalities, it can teach the arts of instruction so that the teachers whom it sends forth can enter the public schoolroom as fully competent.

TEACHING THE ARTS OF INSTRUCTION:—Two systems have been offered in history for the preparation of teachers for their duties—instruction in the theory of education (under which term we may include psychology, pedagogy, the history of education and all other knowledge technical to teaching), and actual practice in a training school.

It is a singular fact that so large a number of intelligent persons, and intelligent institutions for training teachers, have regarded these two methods as alternatives for each other, and assume that each can, more or less perfectly, serve as a substitute for the other. Each has its special pleaders and in these disputes the question to be

settled seems ever to be which is the better of the two. It does not seem to occur to either side of the controversy that theory and practice have separate and distinct functions. Practice forms habits of teaching and no amount of theoretic pedagogy can establish these habits, just as it is impossible for any amount of theoretical physics concerning the principles of equilibrium to teach a person to ride a bicycle. On the other hand, the most skilful bicycle riders have rarely developed the principles of equilibrium. The theory of equilibrium and the habit of bicycle riding are separate and distinct. The same relation, or rather lack of relation, unquestionably exists between practice and theoretic pedagogy. There are excellent teachers in practice who know no theory, and there are excellent theorists who cannot teach. We meet both classes every day and each is entitled to our respect. Practice enables one to go into a schoolroom and conduct a class. Pedagogy furnishes a perspective of intelligence which enables the teacher to know the ultimate purposes of her teaching, to explain the goals of her practice. But practice and pedagogical knowledge are in no sense interchangeable, but are complementary to each other, and every teacher should receive training in both. For class teachers, however, if either one must be slighted it would better be theory rather than practice, for the class teacher *must* have skill in actual teaching; she also ought to have perspective. If she works under the direction of those who possess both good theory and good practice, theory for her is not so essential. It is certainly a singular fact that a large number of normal schools at present and many colleges are pretending to send forth well-equipped teachers without any training, or very inadequate training, in actual teaching. Their students are given theoretical instruction under the false notion that it is a substitute for practice and serves the same end. One equally faulty notion exists in a current system which devotes a long preliminary period to theoretical education followed by a short period at the end of the course when the student devotes all of her time

to practice. Apparently it is supposed that theories can be readily applied. A student filled with theory is not much better off in the classroom for the first time than one without it. One who learns precepts for riding a bicycle is not much better prepared for the task than one who has no precepts. Skill in teaching as in every other kind of habit acquirement is almost exclusively the product of practice. To acquire any habit requires a certain period of time, and it cannot be formed suddenly by merely increasing the hours of practice per day. Moreover, habits which a teacher acquires in teaching arithmetic are not the same in kind as those she must acquire for conducting a recitation in history. The system of crowding the habit acquirements of actual teaching into a few months at the end of a normal course is one which cannot systematically produce well-equipped teachers. Those of good personality obtain certain powers of discipline which enable them, as later teachers, to conceal their deficiencies in other arts until experience perhaps teaches these. Training in practice should extend over the entire normal school course and a limited set of habits should be taken up for acquirement at one time; that is, the teacher should be drilled in the technique of teaching one or two studies at a time, and when these are mastered other techniques may be added.

Training School Teaching.—Actual teaching is supplied in the San Francisco Normal School by a Training School of about 275 pupils, distributed into eighteen or twenty separate classes representing the eight grades of the primary and grammar schools. The number in each class varies from ten to twenty or even twenty-five pupils. The Training School is entirely under the direction of the Normal School. At first tuition in the Training School was free, but numbers increased and a tuition fee is now charged to all new pupils in the grammar grades. Inasmuch as there are practically no academic courses in the normal department all of the members of the faculty are essentially what is generally known as "critic" teachers in the Training School, but this term is not used. "Super-

visor" is preferred as being free from the unpleasant suggestions of the word "critic". Each supervisor has a certain number of classes and the teachers thereof under his or her direct supervision. The Principal of the Training School is responsible for the discipline of the classes and also trains the student teachers in such arts of discipline as may be acquired. The Training School has three changes of student teachers each day. One section of student teachers, known as the A Section, teaches the classes under direction of supervisors from 9 to 10.30; the B Section has charge from 10.30 to 12 M.; and the C Section in the afternoon period. Each student of the Normal School, from the day of her admission to the day of her graduation, teaches or assists in teaching a class during one of the periods stated. The remainder of her time is devoted to preparing lessons for her class, in grade conferences which will be later explained, in attendance upon classes in theory of education, in training in special adaptation of material for teaching, such as elementary science for the schools, drawing, music, manual training, sewing, etc.

Each supervisor has a certain number of classes and their student teachers under his or her direct supervision. The duties of supervisor require a tactful management to the end that both pupils and the student teachers themselves shall keenly feel that the student teachers are in completely responsible charge of the rooms. The supervisors give model lessons in the classrooms, observe the work of the student teachers, and also the progress of individual pupils, but all direction of the student teachers is done behind the scenes by personal advice, and by the system of teachers' conferences. The advantage of this arrangement is that every student obtains practice in teaching under skilled direction covering the period of her entire normal school course, the minimum length of which is two years; the class work for which she has daily to prepare is limited in amount to that which she can thoroughly do well and increases with her power as she obtains this by growth of experience; the pupils have three times a day a new per-

sonality in their teachers, who come freshly and thoroughly prepared to make the most of each lesson for the limited period she is with them; the student teachers and pupils are under the constant supervision of the supervisors who, without exception, are persons of university training, broad pedagogical knowledge and experience of years standing in the public schools.

To each class of pupils two student teachers at a time are assigned, but the amount of teaching each may do varies. Upon entrance to the school, the new student is assigned as an assistant to a student teacher of experience. The assistant at first does not have responsible charge of the class, but assists in various ways until she catches the spirit of the schoolroom. Then gradually she is given additional duties and is intrusted with responsibility. No period is fixed when an assistant is given responsible charge of a class. A very few, of singular capability, have reached this stage in ten weeks, but more often in twenty weeks, while a few have remained in the school nearly two years and have finally left without rising above the stage of assistant. Whenever it is clear to the supervisors that a certain assistant has not the essential elements of the necessary personality, or is fatally defective, she is kindly but firmly informed of the judgment. If she herself is convinced of the truth of the judgment she generally leaves the school, but she is not compelled to leave. If no improvement sufficient to change the faculty's judgment occurs she of course is never given the responsibility of a class and can therefore never be graduated.

Every ten weeks each student who has done acceptable work in her class is changed to another section and grade. For example, a student who successfully conducts a class in reading in the first grade, will be changed to some other grade and subject for a period of a second ten weeks. As there are forty weeks in a year and the minimum experience for graduation is two years, there is opportunity for eight changes of grade and subject during the course. This enables every graduate to have experience of ten

weeks in practically every one of the eight grades, and necessarily all of the following fifteen subjects:—primary grades: reading, language, phonic reading, nature study, composition, primary arithmetic, primary map geography; grammar grades: arithmetic, commercial geography, physical geography, history, grammar, composition, literature, drawing, and music. Every graduate must have ranked as teacher with responsibility of the classroom work and discipline for at least six of these changes or a period of sixty weeks.

The Conference System:—Corresponding in number of lessons which each student teacher teaches in the Training School, the supervisor of each subject conducts what are termed “conferences” of these student teachers. Thus, for example, as the student teachers of primary arithmetic teach five periods per week, there are also five conferences of these teachers per week under direction of the supervisor of this subject. So also in all subjects there are as many conference gatherings under direction of the respective supervisors as there are class recitations in the training school. The conferences of a given group of students upon a given subject continues as long as they teach this subject, i. e. ten weeks. The character of the conference work is of the same general type as that of well conducted grade meetings of teachers in the public schools. The supervisor assigns for study and reports, references to pedagogical theory and methodology and courses of study in the public school bearing upon the subject under treatment. Free discussions of these ensue. The supervisor exacts, in advance, plans of the recitations the students propose to conduct and these are offered as material for discussion in the conferences. The supervisor also takes opportunity in these conferences to regulate the course of study in the training school, to submit various good methods, the pedagogical basis of which is discussed, to correct daily errors, etc., etc. The aim of the supervisor in these conferences is to equip the student teacher with the perspective and background of pedagogical and psy-

chological theory, but he especially avoids forming hard and fast connections of theory. In the actual teaching, however, the supervisor sees to it that at least one good method for dealing with each problem is thoroughly trained into the student as a habit. These general conferences are supplemented by opportunity for personal conferences with the supervisors. After the hours of school until five o'clock, and at such other occasional hours as they may be free, the supervisors are at their desks devoting themselves to taking up individual difficulties with which each student teacher may be laboring.

Technical Knowledge:—Under this term we would include psychology, pedagogy, the history of education and all other technical knowledge which is given by means of lectures, recitations or personal study of books, etc. The sharp distinction between the function of this kind of instruction and the function of actual teaching has already been drawn. The function of the latter is the formation of habits of technique in teaching the subjects of school study, and the management of the classroom. The function of technical or professional knowledge is to furnish perspective and a background of intelligent comprehension of the goals and purposes of school training, the psychology of the methods which practice has developed, etc. But there is no notion in the San Francisco Normal School that the courses in technical or professional knowledge contribute, except indirectly, to the active practice of teaching. This view does not minimize the importance of theoretical study for the intelligent workman is ever more efficient than the rule-of-thumb laborer. Technical knowledge is a necessary complement to practice; it makes practice intelligent teaching. The point we would emphasize is that theory is not practice, and cannot take the place of practice.

Two parallel lines of theoretical study are used. One line consists of a general course, five to three periods a week, in psychology, the history of education and pedagogy, which is given throughout the entire two years. Another line, presenting the special pedagogy of each school subject,

is carried along in the supervisors' conferences. The general course aims to furnish a general culture and perspective for pedagogical questions and to offer a sort of forum for the thorough discussion of past and prevailing theories of education. The method is that of topical readings followed by class digests and discussions of these. In this way there are presented the general conceptions of physiological psychology; the theories of heredity; the psychology of attention, memory, imagination, reasoning, perception and abstraction; the distinction between the pedagogy of the intellect and the pedagogy of the feelings; such pedagogical problems as those of formal discipline, correlation, the Socratic method of the recitation; the history of various systems of educations in the light of previous readings; special applications to purposes and values of teaching history, mathematics, literature, the formal mechanisms, music, drawing, etc. There is no effort in the general course to teach these subjects for themselves, but at every point possible the students are led to the application of these general views to the practical problems of the classroom. The reading materials which serve as a basis for this course includes current books and articles by the following authors: James, Donaldson, Baldwin, Groos, Chamberlain, Romanes, Lloyd Morgan, Butler, Stanley Hall, Dewey, Spencer, Parker; the standard histories of education, and educational articles taken from magazines.

The conference treatment of technical knowledge is much more specific. Each supervisor has collected all serviceable and available books and articles from pedagogical journals and other sources bearing upon the school subject, the teaching of which he or she supervises. Members of the conference in this subject are required to read and take notes upon the books and articles to which topical reference is made. Then, in the conference meetings, reports of these readings are subjected to a discussion in the light of the student's own experience as a teacher of the subject under discussion. In this way the special pedagogy of arithmetic, reading, writing, spelling, history, grammar, literature, etc.,

is thoroughly harrowed — and planted by daily experience. In addition to these there are special courses, academic in method but technical in that they prepare the student teacher in those phases of the subject specially for teaching. There are courses in map drawing "chalk talks," music, civil government, history, sewing, nature study, manual training, and plant physiology.

As a summary of the distinctive elements in the plan of the San Francisco State Normal School the following features may be stated: the school is a strictly professional school requiring for admission the same degree of general scholarship as that set by the universities, but it does not include general scholarship in its courses of instruction. Systematic provision is made for the selection of persons possessing the inborn teaching personality and for the elimination of those who are lacking in essentials of personality. The purpose of the school is limited to the preparation of students of selected personality to be class teachers in the primary and grammar grades. This preparation consists of training in the arts of instruction as habits, and in the technical pedagogy and theory of teaching the school subjects as perspective to the arts acquired in the Training School. The actual teaching of the Training School provides for the practice of ten weeks in each grade and in all standard subjects of the primary and grammar school, under careful supervision, covering a practical experience of at least two years. The daily teaching is accompanied by the study of the theoretic pedagogy of the subjects taught in the Training School.

FREDERICK BURK

STATE NORMAL SCHOOL,
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

YD 03164

U C BERKELEY LIBRARY

C042407785

Faint handwritten text, possibly "Faint"

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

**THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW**

**AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS
WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN
THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY
WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH
DAY AND TO \$1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY
OVERDUE.**

NOV 20 1937

NOV 26 1937	
<i>Faint handwritten notes</i>	
<i>Cancelled</i>	
<i>NOV 29 1937</i>	

Faint handwritten notes

